



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/587,890  | 07/31/2006  | Feng Lin             |                     | 2354             |
| 7590  | 09/30/2010  |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| Lin Feng<br>Blk 110, #12-120<br>Woodlands Street 13<br>Singapore, 730110<br>SINGAPORE |             |                      |                     | CHACKO, SUNIL    |
|   |             | ART UNIT             |                     | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             | 2625                 |                     |                  |
|   |             | MAIL DATE            |                     | DELIVERY MODE    |
|   |             | 09/30/2010           |                     | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|   |                        |                     |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Advisory Action<br/>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|   | 10/587,890             | LIN ET AL.          |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|   | SUNIL CHACKO           | 2625                |

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Benny Q Tieu/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/SUNIL CHACKO/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's Amended Appeal Brief, filed September 16, 2010 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 6-8 are pending.

Examiner mistakenly cited a portion of Parry (#7,177,043 B2) when Examiner intended to use Qiao (# 7,177,043 B2) reference. The portion intended to use was Qiao column 7 lines 13-22 and not Parry paragraph 8. Qiao teaches in this passage how the client uses a URL to obtain the desired data. This portion was also the intended portion recited in the rejection Claim 7 and not Parry paragraph 18.

Applicant argues on Page 2 of Arguments that applicants server never transfers, receives, sends or stores data of the documents. Applicant in Claim 1 recites a first retrieve means for sending inputted number via internet to a first server, which translates said number into the information of receiving a document from a second server via internet. Though Applicant specification may claim that the server never transfers, receives, sends or stores data of the document, this is limitation is not in the recited in the claim. Applicant also argues that Qiao has no function to translate PIN number to URL of print jobs. However, Lodwick teaches print jobs maybe be stored on spooling server according to the PIN, see column 4 lines 14-20. It would have been obvious to one skilled in art to include the pin feature with Qiao second server so that the user could access documents from remote locations; see Qiao column 1 lines 62-66.

Applicant argues on 3 that combining Lodwick in view of Qiao is impossible in technology the applicant also argues that examiner wrote "Qiao proxy server does not store the documents" and hence the Qiao URL will point to no document when printers access the URL. Examiner respectfully disagrees, while the proxy server may not store the documents can still allow printing of the document because the proxy server can obtain the desired documents from the print server so that it can be printed.

Applicant argues that Lodwick has no need for first server, examiner respectfully disagrees. The addition of a proxy server main benefit is to allow the user to access a server from a remote location, see column 1 lines 62-66 and column 2 lines 1-5. The addition of this feature does not lessen the security as the applicant argues because the access is only provided by the request of the owner or administrator of the server.